



3. With regard to Defendant's objection to Requests Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, to the extent that it is withholding any documents on the grounds of attorney-client privilege or attorney work-product privilege, Defendant shall provide a privilege log identifying the documents being withheld forthwith.

4. With regard to Defendant's objection to Plaintiff's Request No. 5, that the request for production of all identified documents is vague and overbroad, said objection is OVERRULED. The Request has been stated with sufficient specificity and Defendant is ORDERED to provide all responsive documents forthwith.

5. With regard to Defendant's objection to Plaintiff's Requests numbered 8 and 9, given that the term "junk yard" is defined in Township ordinances, said objection is OVERRULED. Defendant shall provide all responsive documents forthwith.

6. With regard to Defendant's objection to Plaintiff's Request No. 10, that it "seeks the production of documents that are likely in Plaintiff's possession," said objection is OVERRULED. To the extent that Defendant is aware that requested documents are in Plaintiff's possession, it may identify them rather than producing them, but shall produce further responsive documents on request.

7. With regard to the documents produced Bates stamped Dfs00127 – Dfs00805, Defendant shall, for each document, identify the request to which Defendant claims it is responsive.

BY THE COURT,

---

Susan Paradise Baxter, U.S.D.J.